UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,606	08/25/2003	Richard Harvey	063170.6701	4231
5073 BAKER BOTT	7590 11/19/200 S L.L.P.		EXAMINER	
2001 ROSS AVENUE . SUITE 600			LEWIS, ALICIA M	
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/19/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail l@bakerbotts.com glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

			4
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/648,606	HARVEY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alicia M. Lewis	2164	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period variety received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication (D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 A	ugust 2007.	,	
•	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is	,
closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposition of Claims	•		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray		•	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		,	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers		•	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	•	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	, ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document		ion No.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			
application from the International Bureau	•	,	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		ed.	
•		Soll	
		SAM RIMELL	
Attachment(s)		PRIMARY EXAMINER	
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F		
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	up	

Art Unit: 2164

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to the Pre-Appeal Conference Decision mailed September 6, 2007. Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims represent an abstract idea, directed solely to non-functional descriptive material. When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, in a computer or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement (See MPEP 2106.01).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2164

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois').

With respect to claim 1, Gadbois teaches a web services directory encoded on a computer readable media, the web services directory comprising:

at least one business entity object (elements 232, 242, 252 in Figure 2, paragraphs 28-29); and

at least one user object, wherein the at least one business entity object is arranged under the at least one user object (elements 222 and 224 in Figure 2, paragraphs 27 and 28).

With respect to claim 2, Gadbois teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 1, further comprising:

at least one business service object (element 243 in Figure 2, paragraph 28); and at least one binding template object (element 245 in Figure 2, paragraph 28), wherein the at least one business service object is arranged under the at least one business entity object, and the at least one binding template object is arranged under the at least one business service object (Figure 2).

With respect to claim 3, Gadbois teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 1, wherein the at least one business entity object is arranged under the at least

Art Unit: 2164

one user object by virtue of at least one corresponding user child object (elements 222,

232, 242 and 252 in Figure 2, paragraphs 26-28).

With respect to claim 4, Gadbois teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 1, further comprising at least one domain object, wherein the at least one user object is arranged under the at least one domain object (elements 170 and 210 in Figure 2, paragraph 24, paragraph 26, paragraph 27 lines 1-4).

With respect to claim 5, Gadbois teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 1, further comprising apparatus adapted to implement the web services directory, and in which directory services are invoked (paragraphs 21-25).

With respect to claim 6, Gadbois teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 5, wherein the directory services are invoked using at least one of X.500 and LDAP protocols (paragraph 24 lines 8-12, paragraph 26 lines 10-11).

With respect to claim 7, Gadbois teaches a web services system comprising:
a registry (paragraph 5 lines 19-25) in which businesses may register, the
registry comprising a hierarchical directory including at least one business entity object
(element 232 in Figure 2) and at least one user object (element 222 in Figure 2), the at
least one business entity object being arranged under the at least one user object
(Figure 2, paragraphs 25-28); and

Art Unit: 2164

a storage system for storing business information and accessible via the hierarchical directory (paragraphs 23, 24 and 26).

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Elmore et al. (US 2006/0059107 A1) ('Elmore').

With respect to claim 8, Elmore teaches a web services system comprising:
a registry in which businesses may register, the registry comprising a hierarchical directory comprising (paragraphs 57 and 907):

at least one domain object, wherein the at least one domain object comprises a directory prefix name, and the at least one domain object is a root object of the hierarchal directory (element 461 in Figure 19, paragraph 626; and element 491 in Figure 21, paragraphs 971-973);

at least one user object, wherein the at least one user object identifies a user account for managing at least one business entity object arranged under the at least one user object (elements 467 and 468 in Figure 19, paragraph 626; and element 493 in Figure 21, paragraph 976), and the at least one user object is arranged under the at least one domain object (elements 462 and 463 in Figure 19, paragraph 626; and element 492 in Figure 21, paragraph 976-978); and

a storage system for storing business information and accessible via the hierarchical directory (paragraphs 907, 948 and 1010).

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 10/648,606

Art Unit: 2164

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmore et al. (US 2006/0059107 A1) ('Elmore') in view of Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois').

With respect to claim 9, Elmore teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 8.

Elmore does not teach further comprising:

at least one business service object, wherein the at least one business service object comprises data identifying a technical service, and the at least one business service object is arranged under the at least one business entity object; and

at least one binding template object, wherein the at least one binding template object comprises data identifying a plurality of service specifications, and the at least one binding template object is arranged under the at least one business service object.

Gadbois teaches a registry service (see abstract) in which he teaches:

at least one business service object, wherein the at least one business service object comprises data identifying a technical service, and the at least one business

Art Unit: 2164

service object is arranged under the at least one business entity object (element 243 in Figure 2, paragraph 28); and

at least one binding template object, wherein the at least one binding template object comprises data identifying a plurality of service specifications, and the at least one binding template object is arranged under the at least one business service object (element 245 in Figure 2, paragraph 28).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Elmore by the teaching of Gadbois because at least one business service object and at least one binding template object would enable an efficient means of organizing business information, including relationships with other businesses and publishing entities (Gadbois, paragraph 4).

With respect to claim 10, Elmore as modified teaches the web services directory as recited in claim 9, the hierarchical directory further comprising at least one tmodel object, wherein the at least one tmodel object comprises a keyed reference to the at least one binding template object, and the at least one tmodel object is arranged under the at least one user object (Gadbois, paragraphs 38-39 and 47).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2164

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alicia Lewis November 6, 2007

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER